

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In a Final Office Action dated October 20, 2006 claims 1–32 were rejected under § 102 based on Edsall. Additional comments were provided in an Advisory Action dated December 21, 2006. Applicants amend the claims as shown above and submit that the claims are allowable.

Claim Amendments

The independent claims have been amended to remove the options of snapshotting and journaling, leaving virtualization and migration. As the operation of migration has never been rejected, and this point noted previously, it is submitted that this places the claims in allowable condition.

Prior Arguments

While effectively mooted by the above amendments, Applicants submit that the other arguments made in the prior responses, such as “operating on” in claim 17, “tasks” in claim 18, and the inconsistency between the rejections of claims 18 and 19 are still valid and do not acquiesce to those points by the above amendments.

CONCLUSION

Entry of the amendments is requested as they place the application in condition for allowance. Based on the above Applicants respectfully submit that all of the present claims are allowable.

Respectfully submitted,

January 17, 2007

Filed Electronically

/Keith Lutsch/

Keith Lutsch

Reg. No. 31,851

Email: WCPatent@counselip.com

Wong, Cabello, Lutsch,

Rutherford & Bruculieri, L.L.P

20333 State Highway 249, Suite 600

Houston, TX 77070

Voice: 832-446-2405